arXiv:1404.7784v1 [cs.GT] 30 Apr 2014

Monotonicity, Revenue Equivalence and Budgets

Ahuva Mu'alem[1]

Software Engineering Dept. Ort Braude College of Engineering, Karmiel, Israel.
ahumu@yahoo.com A significant part of this research was done while the author was a Post-Doctoral Fellow at the Social and Information Sciences Laboratory, Caltech.

Abstract. We study multidimensional mechanism design in a common scenario where players have private information about their willingness to pay and their ability to pay. We provide a complete characterization of dominant-strategy incentive-compatible direct mechanisms where over-reporting the budget is not possible. In several settings, reporting larger budgets can be made suboptimal with a small randomized modification to the payments.
We then derive a closely related partial characterization for the general case where players can arbitrarily misreport their private budgets. Immediate applications of these results include simple characterizations for mechanisms with publicly-known budgets and for mechanisms without monetary transfers.
The celebrated revenue equivalence theorem states that the seller's revenue for a broad class of standard auction formats and settings will be the same in equilibrium. Our main application is a revenue equivalence theorem for financially constrained bidders.

1 Introduction

Budget constraints are central to big business auctions. Cramton(1995) states that it realistic to assume that all firms participating in the historic PCS telecommunications spectrum license auction, held on July 1994 by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), were faced with budget constraints. In Google's GSP keyword auction and other search engine advertising platforms, the bidders are required to specify their bids as well as their budget limits (Edelman et al.(2007),Varian(2007) and Aggarwal et al.(2009)).

Classical results in mechanism design literature do not necessarily carry over to common scenarios with budget constraints. Ausubel and Milgrom(2002) showed that the dominant-strategy of the VCG auction breaks down when bidders have limited budgets.[1] Che and Gale(1998) showed a revenue dominance of the standard first-price auction over second-price auction in the presence of budget constraints. On the positive side, several incentive-compatible auctions do carry over. The classical multiple object ascending auction for unit-demand bidders due to DGS generalizes so as to accommodate incentive-compatible auctions for financially constrained bidders (Hatfield and Milgrom(2005) and Aggarwal et al.(2009)).

[1] See also Borgs et al.(2005), Lavi and May(2012) and references therein.

Recently, Dobzinski et al.(2012) showed that the clinching auction due to Ausubel(2004) generalizes if bidders have publicly known budgets. Bhattacharya et al.(2010) further showed that for an infinitely divisible good, a bidder cannot improve her/his utility by reporting a budget smaller than the actual one. They also observed that reporting larger budgets can be made suboptimal with a small randomized modification to the payments.

This paper studies dominant-strategy incentive-compatible deterministic mechanisms in a model with multidimensional types, private values and private budgets with hard constraints (that is, no player can pay more than her actual budget). We shall consider direct revelation mechanisms, which consist of a social choice function and a payment function. A social choice function aggregates player reports of their private values as well as their budgets to select one outcome. We say that a social choice function is *implementable* if there exists a payment function that makes truthful revelation incentive-compatible. The property of a social choice function to be implementable by a unique payment function (up to an additive constant) is called *revenue equivalence*.

In classical mechanism design literature, implementability is intimately connected to monotonicity. In single-item auctions, monotonicity requires that player who reports a higher value must have a greater probability of receiving the item. In general, monotonicity is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for implementability of social choice functions. For single dimensional types (such as single-item auctions) Myerson(1981) showed that monotonicity is also sufficient for any social choice function to be implementable. However, for multiple-item auctions (where players have a loosely correlated values for a distinct subset of items) this is no longer the case. For such multidimensional environments, Rochet(1987) showed that a condition called *cyclic-monotonicity* is necessary and sufficient for implementability. Combinatorially, this condition essentially says that a multidimensional social choice function is implementable if and only if a corresponding graph contains no negative cycle.

Remarkably, monotonicity is also analogous to the celebrated revenue equivalence principle for single-item auctions (Myerson(1981)). However, in general this need not be the case, since revenue equivalence in multidimensional domains is not implied by cyclic-monotonicity. A recent result by Heydenreich et al.(2009) characterizes revenue equivalence in multidimensional domains. The paper shows that revenue equivalence holds if and only if all distances in the above corresponding graph are anti-symmetric. Intuitively, a strengthening of the cyclic-monotonicity condition characterizes revenue equivalence.

While cyclic-monotonicity is a more complex condition than monotonicity, several studies have characterized multidimensional environments for which monotonicity implies cyclic-monotonicity. In a variety of multidimensional domains, monotonicity (or other related simple local properties) is essentially sufficient for any social choice function to be implementable (Jehiel and Moldovanu(2001),Bikhchandani et al.(2006)

Ashlagi et al.(2010),Vohra(2011),Carroll(2012), Archer and Kleinberg(2013), and references therein).[2]

In this paper we find that Rochet's cyclic-monotonicity condition extends to multidimensional environments with private budgets. We show how to circumvent the assumption that players always have the ability to pay up to their respective values, while obtaining a characterization result and a corresponding graph in the same spirit as Rochet. Our second contribution is a generalization of the revenue equivalence characterization by Heydenreich et al.(2009) to multidimensional environments with private budgets.

1.1 Organization of this paper

In Section 2 we derive a simple characterization for multidimensional dominant-strategy incentive-compatible mechanism design without money. Section 3 studies multidimensional dominant-strategy incentive-compatible mechanism design with private budgets. We start with a necessary condition for incentive-compatible private budget settings. We next show the sufficiency of this condition if over-reporting the budget is impossible. We then consider a strengthening of this condition and show its sufficiency for the general case (where players can report any budget).

Section 4 shows a revenue equivalence principle for private budget settings (where players can report any budget) satisfying certain reasonable conditions. Section 5 illustrates the results through examples. All absent proofs can be found in the Appendix.

2 Warm-up: Characterizing Mechanism Design without Money

In this section we consider a multidimensional setting with private values where monetary transfers are infeasible. We show a simple characterization for players with cardinal preferences.

2.1 The Model

We consider a setting with n players and a finite set $\mathcal{A}$ of possible outcomes. Player ℓ's private valuation is determined by $v_\ell \in \mathcal{V}_\ell \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}|}$, where $v_\ell(a)$ is player ℓ's value for outcome $a \in \mathcal{A}$, and $\mathcal{V}_\ell$ is the space of all possible valuations of player ℓ. Let $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{V}_n$ denote the total valuation space. We consider a multidimensional setting with private values (where $v_\ell(a)$ can be nonnegative or negative) and publicly known zero budgets.

A *mechanism design without money* f consists of a social choice function $f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathbf{0} \to \mathcal{A}$ and a zero payment scheme $p : \mathcal{V} \to \mathbf{0}$, where $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. In a

[2] Lavi and Swamy(2009) used cyclic-monotonicity directly to design an incentive-compatible mechanism in a multidimensional scheduling setting.

direct revelation mechanism without money, the social choice function chooses for a vector $v \in \mathcal{V}$ of aggregate reports of all players an outcome $f(v, \mathbf{0})$, whereas the payment scheme assigns a zero payment to each player. A mechanism design without money can be regarded as a mechanism for players with publicly-known zero budgets, where monetary transfers are not feasible. Let $(v_\ell, v_{-\ell})$ denote the aggregate report vector when player ℓ reports v_ℓ and the other players' reports are represented by $v_{-\ell}$.

Definition 1. *A direct revelation mechanism without money $f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathbf{0} \to \mathcal{A}$ is called* dominant-strategy implementable *if for every player ℓ, every $v_\ell,\ v'_\ell \in \mathcal{V}_\ell$ and $v_{-\ell} \in \mathcal{V}_{-\ell}$, the following condition holds:*

$$v_\ell(f(v,\ \mathbf{0})) \geq v_\ell(f(v',\ \mathbf{0})),$$

where $v = (v_\ell,\ v_{-\ell})$ and $v' = (v'_\ell,\ v_{-\ell})$.

Remark 1. When clear from context we will sometimes use the term *implementability* to denote dominant-strategy implementability.

2.2 Presentation Assumptions

Throughout the paper we without loss of generality restrict our attention to a model with a single agent (say, player ℓ) and assume reported valuations $v_{-\ell}$ and budgets of all other players $B_{-\ell}$ to be fixed. This is without loss of generality as all relevant definitions can be interpreted by holding all other players' reports fixed. For simplicity of notation when clear from context we suppress the subscript ℓ and write $\mathcal{V}, v$ and B instead of $\mathcal{V}_\ell, v_\ell$, and B_ℓ. For convenience, we also assume that f is onto (since otherwise A can be condensed to be the range of f).

2.3 The Characterization

For two outcomes a and a' let

$$\delta(a, a') = \inf \{v(a) - v(a') \mid v \in \mathcal{V} \text{ such that } f(v, \mathbf{0}) = a\}. \tag{1}$$

Informally, $\delta(a, a')$ represents the least gain achieved by deviation from a to a', when a is chosen by truthful reporting and a' is chosen by misreporting (while keeping the valuation of other players fixed). Since f is onto, $\delta(a, a') < \infty$. We can now state our simple characterization for implementable mechanisms without money.

Proposition 1. *A mechanism without money $f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathbf{0} \to \mathcal{A}$ is dominant-strategy implementable if and only if $\delta(a, a') \geq 0$ for every $a,\ a' \in \mathcal{A}$.*

Proof. Assume f is implementable without money. For any pair of valuations $v, v' \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $f(v, \mathbf{0}) = a$ and $f(v', \mathbf{0}) = a'$, we have $v(a) \geq v(a')$ by the implementability without money of f. The definition of δ then gives $v(a) - v(a') \geq \delta(a, a') \geq 0$.

Conversely, if f is not implementable without money, there exist $v, v' \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $v(a) < v(a')$, where $f(v, \mathbf{0}) = a$ and $f(v', \mathbf{0}) = a'$. Then, $\delta(a, a') \leq v(a) - v(a') < 0$. □

3 Characterizing Mechanism Design with Private Budgets

In this section we study dominant-strategy incentive-compatible mechanisms in a multidimensional setting where players have private valuations and private budgets.

We continue with the private value setting introduced previously using the following modifications. Player ℓ has private valuation $v_\ell \in \mathcal{V}_\ell \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^{|\mathcal{A}|}$, where $v_\ell(a)$ is player ℓ's *nonnegative* value for outcome $a \in \mathcal{A}$. In addition, player ℓ has private budget $B_\ell \geq 0$. Let $\mathcal{B}_\ell \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \infty$ denote the space of all possible budget limits of player ℓ. Notice that if the budget of player ℓ is *public knowledge* then the set $\mathcal{B}_\ell$ is a singleton.

Players are assumed to be utility maximizers but can never pay beyond their budgets. Specifically, player ℓ's utility with private budget B_ℓ, derived for paying $x \geq 0$ for outcome a, is $v_\ell(a) - x$ as long as $x \leq B_\ell$ and is negative infinity if $x > B_\ell$. Note that we consider here a multidimensional setting with *nonnegative* private values and private budget constraints.

A mechanism $(f,\ p)$ with private budgets consists of a social-choice function $f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ and a payment function $p : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{R}^n$, where $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{V}_n$, $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{B}_n$ and the ℓ^{th} component of p is the payment requirement of player ℓ. We restrict attention to direct revelation mechanisms where each player reports its private valuation $v_\ell \in \mathcal{V}_\ell$, as well as its private budget $B_\ell \in \mathcal{B}_\ell$. Let $v_{-\ell}, B_{-\ell}$ denote the reported valuations and budgets of players other than ℓ.

Definition 2. *A direct revelation mechanism* $(f,\ p)$ *with private budgets is called* dominant-strategy implementable *(or* implementable*, for short) if the following conditions hold:*

1. **(IC)** Incentive Compatibility: For every player $\ell = 1, \ldots, n$, every $v \times B \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B}$, and every $v'_\ell \times B'_\ell \in \mathcal{V}_\ell \times \mathcal{B}_\ell$ if we denote $a = f(v, B)$ and $a' = f((v'_\ell, v_{-\ell}), (B'_\ell, B_{-\ell}))$, then

$$v_\ell(a) - \ p_\ell(v, B) \geq v_\ell(a') \ - \ p_\ell((v'_\ell, v_{-\ell}), (B'_\ell, B_{-\ell})),$$

$$\text{for every } p_\ell((v'_\ell, v_{-\ell}), (B'_\ell, B_{-\ell})) \leq B_\ell.$$

   i.e., no player can improve its utility by misreporting its true private valuation and/or true private budget in order to obtain some other outcome

whose payment is below B_ℓ. If the budget is *public knowledge* then players can only report their true budgets. If *budget over-reporting* is not allowed, then $B'_\ell \leq B_\ell$.

2. **(IR)** Individual Rationality: The mechanism never requires a player to pay more than its reported value.
3. **(BF)** Budget Feasibility: The mechanism never requires a player to pay more than its reported budget.
4. **(NPT)** No Positive Transfer: The mechanism never subsidizes any player with a monetary amount.

Definition 3. *A social choice function f with private budgets is called* implementable *if there exists a payment function p such that the mechanism $(f,\ p)$ is dominant-strategy implementable.*

Graph Theoretic Definitions. To state our main results we use some basic definitions from Graph Theory. Recall that a (directed) *graph* is a pair $G(M, E)$, where M is a finite set and $E \subseteq M \times M$. An element $n \in M$ is called a node and an element $e = (n, n') \in E$ is called an arc. A *complete* directed graph is a graph in which $E = M \times M$.

A (finite) *path* from node n_1 to node n_k in G is a sequence $P = (n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_k)$ in E such that $e_i = (n_i, m_i) \in E$ and $n_{i+1} = m_i$, where $i = 1, \ldots, k-1$. We denote by $e \in P$ that e is an arc in P. A *(finite) cycle* in G is a path $C = (e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_k)$ such that $m_k = n_1$. When clear from the context, the cycle C may be written as $(n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_k)$. To each arc $e \in E$ we assign a *length* $l(e) \in \mathbb{R}$. The length of a path P is $l(P) = \Sigma_{e \in P}\, l(e)$. A path P is called negative if $l(P) < 0$. We denote by $\Delta(n_i, n_k)$ the length of the *shortest path* from node n_i to node n_k in G.

A *strongly connected component* of a directed graph $G = (M, E)$ is a maximal set of vertices $K \subseteq M$ such that for every pair of nodes n_i and n_j in K, there is a path from n_i to n_j, and a path from n_j to n_i. A *directed acyclic graph* is a directed graph with no cycles.

3.1 Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for Private Budgets

Our main result in this section is a necessary and sufficient conditions for the multidimensional private budget setting. Theorem 1 provides a necessary condition for implementability. Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 show the *sufficiency* of the condition in Theorem 1 in several settings. The proof technique is constructive; namely, a concrete payment function is specified to show the sufficiency. Examples 1 and 2 in Section 5 further demonstrate our conditions.

For $a \in \mathcal{A}$, we define

$$\beta(a) = \inf \{B \mid f(v, B) = a \text{ for some } v \in \mathcal{V}\}, \tag{2}$$

$$\omega(a) = \inf \{v(a) \mid f(v, B) = a \text{ for some } B \in \mathcal{B}\}, \tag{3}$$

$$\theta(a) = \min\ \{\beta(a),\ \omega(a)\}. \tag{4}$$

i.e., $\beta(a)$ is the minimum reported budget required to obtain outcome a, and $\omega(a)$ is the minimum reported valuation required to obtain outcome a. Therefore, $\theta(a)$ serves as an upper bound on any budget-feasible individually-rational payment for outcome a, if exists. Since f is onto, $\theta(a) < \infty$.

The next definition is a generalization of (1) to the private budget setting. For $a, a' \in \mathcal{A}$, let

$$\delta(a, a') = \inf\ \{v(a) - v(a') \mid f(v, B) = a,\ \text{where } v \in \mathcal{V} \text{ and } B \in \mathcal{B} \cap [\beta(a'), \infty)\}. \tag{5}$$

We follow the convention that the infimum over an empty set equals ∞ (observe that if $\beta(a') > \beta(a)$, it can be the case that $f(v, B) \neq a$ for every v, B with $B \geq \beta(a')$). Furthermore, if f is implementable then $\delta(a, a') > -\infty$ (see Claim 6.1).

Using δ and θ, we can now construct a finite directed graph associated with the social choice function f.

Definition 4 (The Graph $G_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}$). *Let $G_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}$ be a complete directed graph over the nodes $M(G_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}) = \{1, 2, \ldots, |\mathcal{A}|\}$, i.e., the nodes of the graph correspond to all possible outcomes. The* length *of a directed arc $(i, k) \in E(G_{f,\,\mathcal{B}})$ is defined as*

$$l(i,\ k) = \min\{\delta(a_i,\ a_k),\ \theta(a_i)\}.$$

We can now state our necessity result:

Theorem 1. *If a social choice function $f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ with private budgets is implementable then the corresponding graph $G_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}$ contains no negative cycles.*

We now consider the case where over-reporting the budget is impossible and show the *sufficiency* of the condition in Theorem 1. This allows us to derive a complete characterization of the class of implementable social choice functions where over-reporting the private budget is impossible. This class is rather general, it includes mechanisms without money, mechanisms for players with publicly-known budgets and more. In several settings, reporting larger budgets can be made a dominated strategy (suboptimal) by using a small randomized modification to the payments (Bhattacharya et al.(2010)).

Theorem 2. *A social choice function $f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ for private budgets with no budget over-reporting is implementable if and only if the corresponding graph $G_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}$ contains no negative cycles.*

Example 1 shows that the no budget over-reporting assumption is crucial to the sufficiency in Theorem 2. Notice that Proposition 1 is not a special case of Theorem 2, since here we restrict the values to be nonnegative.

We now consider the general setting of private budgets (assuming players can report any budget limit) and provide a sufficient condition for implementability,

that differs from the necessary condition in Theorem 1. Our sufficient condition for implementability requires a subtle but crucial change in (5). For $a, a' \in \mathcal{A}$, we define

$$\widehat{\delta}(a, a') = \inf \{v(a) - v(a') \mid f(v, B) = a, \text{ where } v \in \mathcal{V} \text{ and } B \in \mathcal{B}\}. \quad (6)$$

Clearly, $\widehat{\delta}(a, a') \leq \delta(a, a')$. Additionally, if the budget is publicly known or if $\beta(a') \leq \beta(a)$ then $\widehat{\delta}(a, a') = \delta(a, a')$.

Definition 5 (The Graph $\widehat{G}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}$). *Let $\widehat{G}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}$ be a complete directed graph over the nodes $M(G_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}) = \{1, 2, \ldots, |\mathcal{A}|\}$, i.e., the nodes of the graph correspond to all possible outcomes. The* length *of a directed arc $(i, k) \in E(G_{f,\,\mathcal{B}})$ is defined as*

$$l(i,\ k) = \min\{\widehat{\delta}(a_i,\ a_k),\ \theta(a_i)\}.$$

If the graph $\widehat{G}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}$ contains no negative cycles then so does $G_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}$, but not vice versa.

We can now state our sufficiency results for private budgets (assuming players can report any budget limit).

Proposition 2. *Let $f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ be a social choice function with private budgets. If the corresponding graph $\widehat{G}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}$ contains no negative cycles then $f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ is implementable.*

Example 2 shows an implementable social choice function whose corresponding graph $\widehat{G}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}$ contains a negative cycle. However, if $\widehat{G}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}} = G_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}$, then the condition in Proposition 2 is also necessary.

Theorem 3. *Let $f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ be a social choice function with private budgets. If $\widehat{\delta}(a, a') = \delta(a, a')$ for every $a, a' \in \mathcal{A}$ then $f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ is implementable if and only if the corresponding graph $G_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}$ contains no negative cycles.*

Proof. Immediate from Theorem 1 and Proposition 2 (notice that Theorem 2 is of no use here, since players can over-report their budget limits). □

4 Revenue Equivalence with Budgets

The celebrated revenue equivalence principle says that any two payment function implementing the same social choice function differ by a constant, and thus the payment function is uniquely defined up to an additive constant. The uniqueness for budget constraints players is slightly more subtle.

Recall that by Lemma 1 (using the presentation assumptions in Subsection 2.2) if $f(v, B) = f(v', B') = a$ for some $a \in \mathcal{A}$ we have that $p(v, B) = p(v, B') = p_a$. When players have budget constraints, any two payment functions implementing the same $f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ might be differ by a *collection* of constants. Intuitively, there might be a distinct constant for every budget level $\beta(a)$, where $\beta(a)$ denotes the minimum reported budget required to obtain outcome $a \in \mathcal{A}$.

Definition 6 (Revenue Equivalence). *An implementable social choice function $f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ satisfies the revenue equivalence principle if for every two dominant strategy implementable mechanisms (f, p) and (f, p'), we have that $\beta(a) = \beta(a')$ implies that*

$$p_a - p'_a = p_{a'} - p'_{a'}.$$

Notice that if $\beta(a) \neq \beta(\widehat{a})$ then $p_{\widehat{a}} - p'_{\widehat{a}}$ need not be equal to $p_a - p'_a$.

4.1 Assumptions

We shall show, under several reasonable assumptions, that a necessary and sufficient condition for revenue equivalence with private budget do exists. We now state our assumptions on f.

Definition 7 (Generic Implementation at a_i). *Let $f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ be a social choice function, and let $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$. We say that a payment function $p : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{R}$* generically implements *f at a_i if*

1. *(f, p) is a dominant strategy implementable mechanism.*
2. *Let $a_j \in \mathcal{A}$. If $\beta(a_j) = \beta(a_i) > 0$ then $0 < p_{a_j} < \theta(a_j)$.*
3. *Let $a_j, a_k \in \mathcal{A}$. If $\beta(a_k) < \beta(a_j) = \beta(a_i)$ then $p_{a_j} - p_{a_k} \neq \delta(a_j, a_k)$.*
4. *Let $a_j, a_k \in \mathcal{A}$. If $\beta(a_k) > \beta(a_j) = \beta(a_i)$, $f(v, b) = a_j$ and $v(a_j) - v(a_k) \geq p_{a_j} - p_{a_k}$ then $v(a_j) - v(a_k) > p_{a_j} - p_{a_k}$.*

If $p : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{R}$ generically implements f at a_i, we say that f is generically implementable at a_i.

Intuitively, the assumption requires strict inequalities (recall Claim 6.1). Notice that in Definition 7, part (4) it might be the case that $p_{a_k} > \beta(a_j)$.

Definition 8. *A social choice function $f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ is* generically implementable *if for every $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists a payment function $p^i : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{R}$ that generically implements f at a_i.*

4.2 Characterization

In this subsection we extend a recent characterization of revenue equivalence for multidimensional domains by Heydenreich et al.(2009). We state our characterization result for private budgets and then briefly discuss the differences between the proof techniques. Recall that $\Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(i, i')$ is the length of the *shortest path* from node i to node i' in the graph $G_{f,\mathcal{B}}$.

Theorem 4 (Characterization of Revenue Equivalence). *A generically implementable social choice function $f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ for private budgets satisfies the revenue equivalence principle if and only if in all corresponding graphs $G_{f,\mathcal{B}}$ obtained from a combination of a player and a reported valuations and budgets of the other players we have that $\Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(i, k) = -\Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(k, i)$ for all $a_i, a_k \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\beta(a_i) = \beta(a_k)$.*

Observe that $f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ is implementable, and thus the proof of Theorem 4 only requires the necessary condition in Theorem 1. Therefore, Theorem 4 is applicable for private budget settings (where players can report any budget limit) satisfying the condition in Definition 8.

Essentially, the original proof of Heydenreich et al.(2009) constructs certain payments based on the specific shortest paths of the graph. However, if $\Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(i,k) = -\Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(k,i)$ holds then this implies that these payments can be negative. In our setting, negative payments are excluded by the no positive transfer requirement. Instead, our necessity proof (Claim 6.4) requires a subtle strongly-component argument and thus is different from theirs. Our sufficiency proof (Claim 6.4) is based on a straight-forward adaptation of Heydenreich et al.(2009) and on Theorem 1.

5 Examples

This section illustrates our characterization results through some examples.

Example 1. We show that the no budget over-reporting assumption is crucial to the sufficiency in Theorem 2. Consider a single player with possible outcomes $\mathcal{A} = \{a, a'\}$, possible private budgets $\mathcal{B} = \{10, 20\}$, and possible values $\mathcal{V} = \{v, v'\}$, where $v(a) = 20, v(a') = 10$ and $v'(a) = 11, v'(a') = 0$. Let $f(v, 20) = f(v', 20) = a$ and $f(v, 10) = f(v', 10) = a'$. If over reporting the budget is not allowed, then the payment function $p_a = 10$ and $p_{a'} = 0$ implements f. However, if reporting any budget is allowed then no payment implements f. To see this, observe that $p_{a'}$ must be 0 since $f(v', 10) = a'$. Then, since $f(v, 20) = a$ we have $10 = v(a) - v(a') \geq p_a - p_{a'}$, and therefore $p_a \leq 10$. But then if the true type of the player is $(v', 10)$ it is beneficial to misreport $(v', 20)$. Observe that $G_{f,\mathcal{B}}$ contains no negative cycle, since $\min\{\delta(a, a'),\ \theta(a, a')\} = 10$, $\min\{\delta(a', a),\ \theta(a', a)\} = \min\{\infty, 0\} = 0$.

In this example we also have that $\widehat{G}_{f,\mathcal{B}}$ contains a negative cycle (since $\min\{\widehat{\delta}(a, a'),\ \theta(a, a')\} = 10$, $\min\{\widehat{\delta}(a', a),\ \theta(a', a)\} = -11$) and thus $\widehat{G}_{f,\mathcal{B}} \neq G_{f,\mathcal{B}}$.

Example 2. We show an implementable f whose corresponding graph $\widehat{G}_{f,\mathcal{B}}$ contains a negative cycle (and therefore the condition in Proposition 2 is sufficient but not necessary for implementability). Consider a single player with possible outcomes $\mathcal{A} = \{a, a'\}$, possible private budgets $\mathcal{B} = \{1, 5\}$, and possible values $\mathcal{V} = \{v, v'\}$, where $v(a) = 20, v(a') = 10$ and $v'(a) = 10, v'(a') = 0$. Let $f(v, 5) = f(v', 5) = a$ and $f(v, 1) = f(v', 1) = a'$. Clearly, the payment function $p_a = 5$ and $p_{a'} = 0$ implements f. However, $\min\{\widehat{\delta}(a, a'),\ \theta(a, a')\} = 5$, $\min\{\widehat{\delta}(a', a),\ \theta(a', a)\} = -10$, that is (a, a') is a negative cycle in $\widehat{G}_{f,\mathcal{B}}$. To demonstrate Claim 6.1 notice that $\widehat{\delta}(a', a) < p_{a'} - p_a = -5 \leq \delta(a', a) = \infty$.

We next consider a broad class of social choice functions known as affine maximizers. This class encompasses the extensively studied class of weighted VCG mechanisms. We begin with the definition of this class.

Definition 9. *A social choice function f is called an* affine maximizer *if for some player weights $\kappa_1 > 0, \ldots, \kappa_n > 0$ and some outcome weights $\gamma_a \in \mathbb{R}$ for every $a \in \mathcal{A}$, we have that:*

$$f(v_1, \ldots, v_n) \in \text{argmax}_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \{\sum_{\ell} \kappa_\ell \cdot v_\ell(a) + \gamma_a\}.$$

We next consider a natural mechanism without money for 0/1 valuations (intuitively, each player can vote for all his most preferred alternatives, assuming all are equally desired).

Claim. The mechanism without money $f(v_1, \ldots, v_n) \in \text{argmax}_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \{\sum_{\ell} \kappa_\ell \cdot v_\ell(a) + \gamma_a\}$, where $v_\ell(a) \in \{0, 1\}$ for every $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ (assuming that ties among outcomes are broken lexicographically) satisfies the condition in Proposition 1 and therefore is dominant-strategy implementable.

As stated informally in Borgs et al.(2005) no affine maximizer is implementable with private budgets if the players can specify their budget limits in addition to reporting their valuations (since players can over-report their values while under-reporting their budgets to avoid charges). We use our characterization to address the publicly-known budget case (where players cannot misreport their budgets).

Claim. Suppose that $\mathcal{V}_\ell = \mathbb{R}_+^{|\mathcal{A}|}$ for every player ℓ and let $n \geq 2$. If at least one player has budget $< \infty$, then no affine maximizer is implementable with publicly-known budgets.

Acknowledgments

I thank Sushil Bikhchandani, Shahar Dobzinski, Federico Echenique, David Kempe, Ron Lavi, John Ledyard, Alexander Linden, Noam Nisan and Motty Perry for early discussions and helpful suggestions.

References

[Aggarwal et al.(2009)]G. Aggarwal, S. Muthukrishnan, D. Pal, and M. Pal. General auction mechanism for search advertising. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on World Wide Web, WWW '09*, pages 241–250, 2009.

[Archer and Kleinberg(2013)]A. Archer and R. Kleinberg. Truthful germs are contagious: a local to global characterization of truthfulness. *Games and Economic Behavior*, To Appear, 2013.

[Ashlagi et al.(2010)]I. Ashlagi, M. Braverman, A. Hassidim, and D. Monderer. Monotonicity and implementability. *Econometrica*, 78(5):1749–1772, 2010.

[Ausubel(2004)]L. M. Ausubel. An efficient ascending-bid auction for multiple objects. *American Economic Review*, 94(5):1452–1475, 2004.

[Ausubel and Milgrom(2002)]L. M. Ausubel and P. R. Milgrom. Ascending auctions with package bidding. *The B.E. Journal of Theoretical Economics*, 1(1):1–44, August 2002.

[Bhattacharya et al.(2010)]S. Bhattacharya, V. Conitzer, K. Munagala, and L. Xia. Incentive compatible budget elicitation in multi-unit auctions. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA '10*, pages 554–572, 2010.

[Bikhchandani et al.(2006)]S. Bikhchandani, S. Chatterji, R. Lavi, A. Mu'alem, N. Nisan, and A. Sen. Weak monotonicity characterizes deterministic dominant strategy implementation. *Econometrica*, 74(4):1109–1132, 2006.

[Borgs et al.(2005)]C. Borgs, J. Chayes, N. Immorlica, M. Mahdian, and A. Saberi. Multi-unit auctions with budget-constrained bidders. In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM conference on Electronic commerce*, EC '05, pages 44–51. ACM, 2005.

[Carroll(2012)]G. Carroll. When are local incentive constraints sufficient? *Econometrica*, 80(2):661–686, 2012.

[Che and Gale(1998)]Y.-K. Che and I. Gale. Standard auctions with financially constrained bidders. *Review of Economic Studies*, 65(1):1–21, 1998.

[Cormen et al.(2009)]Thomas H. Cormen, Charles E. Leiserson, Ronald L. Rivest, and Clifford Stein. *Introduction to Algorithms (3. ed.)*. MIT Press, 2009. ISBN 978-0-262-03384-8.

[Cramton(1995)]P. C. Cramton. Money out of thin air: The nationwide narrowband pcs auction. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, 4(2):267–343, Summer 1995.

[Demange et al.(1986)]G. Demange, D. Gale, and M. Sotomayor. Multi-item auctions. *Journal of Political Economy*, 94(4):863–872, 1986.

[Dobzinski et al.(2012)]S. Dobzinski, R. Lavi, and N. Nisan. Multi-unit auctions with budget limits. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 74(2):486–503, 2012.

[Edelman et al.(2007)]Benjamin Edelman, Michael Ostrovsky, and Michael Schwarz. Internet advertising and the generalized second-price auction: Selling billions of dollars worth of keywords. *American Economic Review*, 97(1):242–259, March 2007.

[Hatfield and Milgrom(2005)]J. W. Hatfield and P. R. Milgrom. Matching with contracts. *American Economic Review*, 95(4):913–935, 2005.

[Heydenreich et al.(2009)]B. Heydenreich, R. Müller, M. Uetz, and R. V. Vohra. Characterization of revenue equivalence. *Econometrica*, 77(1):307–316, 2009.

[Jehiel and Moldovanu(2001)]P. Jehiel and B. Moldovanu. Efficient design with interdependent valuations. *Econometrica*, 69(5):1237–1259, 2001.

[Lavi and Swamy(2009)]R. Lavi and C. Swamy. Truthful mechanism design for multidimensional scheduling via cycle monotonicity. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 67 (1):99–124, 2009.

[Lavi and May(2012)]Ron Lavi and Marina May. A note on the incompatibility of strategy-proofness and pareto-optimality in quasi-linear settings with public budgets. *Economics Letters*, 115(1):100–103, 2012.

[Myerson(1981)]R. B. Myerson. Optimal auction design. *Mathematics of Operation Research*, 6:58–73, 1981.

[Rochet(1987)]J.-C. Rochet. A necessary and sufficient condition for rationalizability in a quasi-linear context. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 16:191–200, 1987.

[Saks and Yu(2005)]M. Saks and L. Yu. Weak monotonicity suffices for truthfulness on convex domains. In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM conference on Electronic commerce*, EC '05, pages 286–293. ACM, 2005.

[Varian(2007)]Hal R. Varian. Position auctions. *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 25(6):1163–1178, December 2007.

[Vohra(2011)]R. V. Vohra. *Mechanism Design*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

6 Appendix: Proofs

6.1 Proof of Theorem 1

The proof of Theorem 1 is the consequence of the following taxation principle lemma and claims.

Lemma 1 (Borgs et al.(2005)). *Let* $(f,\ p)$ *be an implementable mechanism for private budgets. Let*

$$\mathcal{A}(v_{-\ell}, B_{-\ell}) = \{a_k \in \mathcal{A} \mid \exists v'_\ell \in \mathcal{V}_l \text{ and } \exists B'_\ell \in \mathcal{B}_\ell \text{ such that } f((v'_\ell, v_{-\ell}), (B'_\ell, B_{-\ell})) = a_k\}.$$

The following conditions hold:

1. For every ℓ, every $v_{-\ell}$ and every $B_{-\ell}$ there exist prices $p_{a_k} \in \mathbb{R}$, for every $a_k \in \mathcal{A}(v_{-\ell}, B_{-\ell})$, such that for all v_ℓ and all B_ℓ with $f((v_\ell, v_{-\ell}), (B_\ell, B_{-\ell})) = a_k$ we have that $p((v_\ell, v_{-\ell}), (B_\ell, B_{-\ell})) = p_{a_k} \leq B_\ell$.
2. For every v_ℓ and every B_ℓ we have that

$$f((v_\ell, v_{-\ell}), (B_\ell, B_{-\ell})) \in \operatorname{argmax}_{a_k \in S} \{v_\ell(a_k) - p_{a_k}\},$$

where $S = \{a_k \in \mathcal{A}(v_{-\ell}, B_{-\ell}) \mid p_{a_k} \leq B_\ell\}$

Proof. Let $(v, B) = ((v_\ell,\ v_{-\ell}), (B_\ell,\ B_{-\ell}))$ and $(v', B') = ((v'_\ell,\ v_{-\ell}), (B'_\ell,\ B_{-\ell}))$.

First, suppose that $f(v, B) = f(v', B')$ but $p_\ell(v, B) > p_\ell(v', B')$. Then, $v_\ell(f(v, B)) - p_\ell(v, B) < v_\ell(f(v', B)) - p_\ell(v', B')$, while by budget feasibility (BF) we have $p_\ell(v', B') < p_\ell(v, B) \leq B_\ell$, contradicting incentive compatibility (IC).

Second, suppose that $f(v, B) \notin \operatorname{argmax}_{a_k \in S} \{v_\ell(a_k) - p_{a_k}\}$ and let $f(v', B') = a_i$ where $a_i \in \operatorname{argmax}_{a_k \in S} \{v_\ell(a_k) - p_{a_k}\}$. As before, $v_\ell(f(v, B)) - p_\ell(v, B) < v_\ell(f(v', B)) - p_\ell(v', B)$, where $p_\ell(v', B') = p_{a_i} \leq B_\ell$, contradicting incentive compatibility (IC). □

Claim. If $f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ is implementable then $\delta(a, a') \geq p_a - p_{a'} > -\infty$, for all $a, a' \in \mathcal{A}$.

Proof. If $\delta(a, a') = \infty$, the claim trivially holds. Otherwise, for every sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ there exist v and $B \geq \beta(a')$, where $f(v, B) = a$ and $v(a) - v(a') \leq \delta(a, a') + \epsilon$.

By Lemma 1, no positive transfer (NPT) and (5), we have $p(v, B) = p_a$, where $0 \leq p_a \leq \beta(a) \leq B$ and $0 \leq p_{a'} \leq \beta(a') \leq B$.

Now, $\delta(a, a') + \epsilon \geq v(a) - v(a') \geq p_a - p_{a'}$ by incentive compatibility (IC). Therefore, $\delta(a, a') \geq p_a - p_{a'} > -\infty$, as required. □

Claim. Let C be a finite cycle in the graph $G_{f,\mathcal{B}}$. If $f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ is implementable and $l(i, k) = \delta(a_i, a_k)$ for every arc $(i, k) \in C$ then C is a nonnegative cycle.

Proof. We prove the claim by contradiction. Suppose there exists a finite negative cycle C in the graph $G_{f,\mathcal{B}}$ such that $l(i,k) = \delta(a_i, a_k)$ for every arc $(i,k) \in C$. We can assume without loss of generality that C is a *simple cycle* (with no repeated nodes). Otherwise, we can split it into two cycles, where one of them must clearly be negative. The process repeats until we are left with a negative simple cycle.

Without loss of generality (by renaming outcomes if necessary), we assume that $C = (1, 2, \ldots, k)$, where $k \leq |\mathcal{A}|$. In particular, $l(1,2) + l(2,3) + \cdots + l(k-1,k) + l(k,1) = \delta(a_1, a_2) + \cdots + \delta(a_{k-1}, a_k) + \delta(a_k, a_1) < 0$.

By Claim 6.1, $\delta(a_i, a_{i+1}) \geq p_{a_i} - p_{a_{i+1}}$. Adding these inequalities together leads to

$$\delta(a_1, a_2) + \delta(a_2, a_3) + \cdots + \delta(a_{k-1}, a_k) + \delta(a_k, a_1) \geq p_{a_1} - p_{a_2} + p_{a_2} - p_{a_3} + \cdots - p_{a_1} = 0.$$

But this contradicts the assumption that C is a negative cycle. □

Claim. Let C be a finite cycle in the graph $G_{f,\mathcal{B}}$. If $f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ is implementable and $l(i,k) = \theta(a_i)$ for some arc $(i,k) \in C$ then C is a nonnegative cycle.

Proof. Suppose the claim is false. Let C be a negative cycle in the graph $G_{f,\mathcal{B}}$ and let $I^+ = \{(i,k) \in C \mid l(i,k) = \theta(a_i)\}$. By Claim 6.1, the set I^+ is nonempty.

We can assume that C is a simple cycle (by Claim 6.1 and its proof). Without loss of generality (by renaming outcomes if necessary), we can further assume that $C = (1, 2, \ldots, m)$. Therefore, $l(1,2) + l(2,3) + \cdots + l(m-1,m) + l(m,1) < 0$. Now, since $l(e) \geq 0$, for every arc $e \in I^+$, there must exist $i < k < m$ such that $l(i, i+1) + l(i+1, i+2) + \cdots + l(k, k+1) < 0$, where $(k, k+1) \in I^+$ and $(i, i+1), (i+1, i+2), \ldots, (k-1, k) \notin I^+$. In particular, $l(i, i+1) + \cdots + l(k, k+1) = \delta(a_i, a_{i+1}) + \cdots + \delta(a_{k-1}, a_k) + \theta(a_k) < 0$.

By Claim 6.1, $0 > \delta(a_i, a_{i+1}) + \cdots + \delta(a_{k-1}, a_k) + \theta(a_k) \geq p_{a_i} - p_{a_k} + \theta(a_k)$. This implies that $p_{a_k} > p_{a_i} + \theta(a_k)$. By no positive transfer (NPT), we have $p_{a_i} \geq 0$ and therefore $p_{a_k} > \theta(a_k)$. Consider two cases:

Case 1. Assume first that $\theta(a_k) = \beta(a_k)$. By definition, there exist v, B and a small enough $\epsilon \geq 0$ such that $f(v, B) = a_k$, where $B = \beta(a_k) + \epsilon$. Therefore, $p_{a_k} > \beta(a_k) + \epsilon$, contradicting budget feasibility (BF).

Case 2. Next assume that $\theta(a_k) = \omega(a_k)$. By definition, there exist v, B and a small enough $\epsilon \geq 0$ such that $f(v, B) = a_k$, where $v(a_k) = \omega(a_k) + \epsilon$. Therefore, $p_{a_k} > \omega(a_k) + \epsilon$, contradicting individual rationality (IR). □

6.2 Proof of Theorem 2

The first direction is by Theorem 1. The other direction follows from the next two claims. We start by defining one more graph.

Definition 10 (The Graph $H_{f,\mathcal{B}}$). *Let $M(H_{f,\mathcal{B}}) = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, |\mathcal{A}|\}$ be the node set of the graph, where 0 is a special node, and $\{1, 2, \ldots, |\mathcal{A}|\}$ correspond*

to all possible outcomes. Let $E(H_{f,\mathcal{B}}) = E_0 \cup E_1 \cup E_2$ *be the directed arc set of the graph, where*

$$E_0 = \{(i,k) \mid i,k > 0 \text{ and } \delta(a_i, a_k) < \infty\},$$

$$E_1 = \{(0,k) \mid k > 0\},$$

$$E_2 = \{(i,0) \mid i > 0\}.$$

Finally, the length of a directed arc $(i,\ k) \in E(H_{f,\mathcal{B}})$ *is defined as follows:*

$$l_H(i,k) = \begin{cases} \delta(a_i, a_k) & \text{if } (i,k) \in E_0 \\ 0 & \text{if } (i,k) \in E_1 \\ \theta(a_i) & \text{if } (i,k) \in E_2. \end{cases}$$

Claim. If $G_{f,\mathcal{B}}$ contains no finite negative cycles then $H_{f,\mathcal{B}}$ contains no finite negative cycles.

Proof. Suppose by contradiction that there exists a finite negative cycle C in $H_{f,\mathcal{B}}$. Since all arcs in $E(H_{f,\mathcal{B}})$ have length $< \infty$, it suffices to show that there exists a finite cycle C' in $G_{f,\mathcal{B}}$ with a smaller length. First assume that $e \in E_0 \cap C$. Add e to C', and notice that $l(e) \leq l_H(e)$. Next assume that $e = (i,0) \in E_2 \cap C$ for some $i > 0$. Clearly, the consecutive arc in C must have the form $e' = (0,k) \in E_1$ for some $k > 0$. Add (i,k) to C', and notice that $l(i,k) \leq l_H(i,0) + l_H(0,k)$. □

Claim. If $H_{f,\mathcal{B}}$ contains no finite negative cycles then $f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ for private budgets with no budget over-reporting is implementable.

Proof. Consider the payment $p_{a_i} = \Delta_{H_{f,B}}(i,0)$, where $\Delta_{H_{f,B}}(i,0)$ denotes the length of the shortest path from node $i > 0$ to node 0 in the graph $H_{f,B}$.

Since $H_{f,\mathcal{B}}$ contains no negative cycles, we have that $\Delta_{H_{f,B}}(i,0) > -\infty$. In addition, $\Delta_{H_{f,B}}(i,0) \leq l_H(i,0) = \theta(a_i) < \infty$, since a_i can be obtained for some report of the player (recall our assumption that f is onto). This shows that the payment satisfies individual rationality (IR) and budget feasibility (BF). To show no positive transfer (NPT), recall that $l_H(0,i) = 0$ and so $p_{a_i} = \Delta_{H_{f,B}}(i,0) = l_H(0,i) + \Delta_{H_{f,B}}(i,0) \geq 0$, since all cycles have nonnegative length.

To show incentive compatibility (IC), assume for the purpose of contradiction that the player can benefit from reporting v', B' instead of its true value v and true budget B. Specifically, $f(v,B) = a_i$ and $f(v',B') = a_k$, but $v(a_i) - \Delta_{H_{f,B}}(i,0) < v(a_k) - \Delta_{H_{f,B}}(k,0)$. By budget feasibility at (v,B) and (v',B'), we have $\Delta_{H_{f,B}}(i,0) \leq \beta(a_i) \leq B$ and $\Delta_{H_{f,B}}(k,0) \leq \beta(a_k) \leq B'$. Importantly, since the player cannot over-report its private budget we have $\beta(a_k) \leq B' \leq B$, and therefore $\delta(a_i, a_k) \leq v(a_i) - v(a_k) < \infty$.

Now, $l_H(i,k) + \Delta_{H_{f,B}}(k,0) = \delta(a_i, a_k) + \Delta_{H_{f,B}}(k,0) \leq v(a_i) - v(a_k) + \Delta_{H_{f,B}}(k,0) < \Delta_{H_{f,B}}(i,0)$. Notice that $l_H(i,k) + \Delta_{H_{f,B}}(k,0)$ represents a length of a path from node i to node 0 through node k in the graph $H_{f,B}$. By the above, $l_H(i,k) + \Delta_{H_{f,B}}(k,0)$ is strictly smaller than $\Delta_{H_{f,B}}(i,0)$, the length of the shortest path from node i to 0, a contradiction to the minimality of $\Delta_{H_{f,B}}(i,0)$. □

6.3 Proof of Proposition 2

We start by defining a related graph:

Definition 11 (The graph $\widehat{H}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}$). *Let the* node set *of the graph be* $M(\widehat{H}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}) = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, |\mathcal{A}|\}$. *Let the* directed arc set *of the graph be* $E(\widehat{H}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}) = E_0 \cup E_1 \cup E_2$, *where*

$$E_0 = \{(i,\ k) \mid i,\ k > 0 \text{ and } \widehat{\delta}(a_i,\ a_k) \leq \theta(a_i)\},$$

$$E_1 = \{(0,\ k) \mid k > 0\},$$

$$E_2 = \{(i,\ 0) \mid i > 0\}.$$

Finally, the length of the directed arc (i, k) *is defined as follows:*

$$l(i,k) = \begin{cases} \widehat{\delta}(a_i,\ a_k) & \text{if } (i,\ k) \in E_0 \\ 0 & \text{if } (i,\ k) \in E_1 \\ \theta(a_i) & \text{if } (i,\ k) \in E_2. \end{cases}$$

Claim. If $\widehat{G}_{f,\mathcal{B}}$ contains no finite negative cycles then $\widehat{H}_{f,\mathcal{B}}$ contains no finite negative cycles.

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Claim 6.2. □

Claim. If $\widehat{H}_{f,\mathcal{B}}$ contains no finite negative cycles then $f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ for private budgets is implementable.

Proof. Consider the payment $p_{a_i} = \Delta_{\widehat{H}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}}(i, 0)$, where $\Delta_{\widehat{H}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}}(i, 0)$ denotes the length of the shortest path from node $i > 0$ to node 0 in the directed graph $\widehat{H}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}$.

The first part of the proof is similar to the proof of Claim 6.2. In particular, it shows that $\Delta_{\widehat{H}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}}(i, 0)$ satisfies BA, IR and NPT.

It remains to show the incentive compatibility (IC). Suppose to the contrary that there exist v, v', B, B' such that $f(v, B) = a_i,\ f(v', B') = a_k$ and $v(a_i) - \Delta_{\widehat{H}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}}(i, 0) < v(a_k) - \Delta_{\widehat{H}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}}(k, 0)$, where $\Delta_{\widehat{H}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}}(k, 0) \leq B$.

Now, if $(i, k) \in E(\widehat{H}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}})$, then by rearranging we have that

$$l(i,k) + \Delta_{\widehat{H}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}}(k, 0) = \widehat{\delta}(a_i,\ a_k) + \Delta_{\widehat{H}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}}(k, 0) \leq v(a_i) - v(a_k) + \Delta(k, 0) < \Delta_{\widehat{H}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}}(i, 0).$$

The left-hand side represents a length of a direct path from i to 0 (through k) which is strictly smaller than $\Delta_{\widehat{H}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}}(i, 0)$, the length of the shortest path from i to 0, a contradiction to the minimality of $\Delta_{\widehat{H}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}}(i, 0)$.

Otherwise, $(i, k) \notin E(\widehat{H}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}})$, and thus $\widehat{\delta}(a_i,\ a_k) > \theta(a_i)$. By BA and IR we have

$$v_i(a_i) - v_i(a_k) + \Delta_{\widehat{H}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}}(k, 0) < \Delta_{\widehat{H}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}}(i, 0) \leq \theta(a_i) < \widehat{\delta}(a_i,\ a_k) \leq v_i(a_i) - v_i(a_k).$$

By rearranging we have that $\Delta_{\widehat{H}_{f,\,\mathcal{B}}}(k, 0) < 0$, a contradiction to NPT. □

6.4 Proof of Theorem 4

The proof is the consequence of the following claims.

Claim. Let $f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ be a generically implementable social choice function for private budgets. If f satisfies the revenue equivalence principle then $\Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(i,k) = -\Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(k,i)$ for all $a_i, a_k \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\beta(a_i) = \beta(a_k)$.

Proof. By Theorem 1, the graph $G_{f,\mathcal{B}}$ contains no negative length cycles, and therefore $\Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(i,k) + \Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(k,i) \geq 0$ for all $a_i, a_k \in \mathcal{A}$. If $\beta(a_i) = \beta(a_k) = 0$, then $\theta(a_i) = \theta(a_k) = 0$ (since the valuation is nonnegative) and therefore $l(i,k) \leq 0$, and $l(k,i) \leq 0$. Observe that none of these arcs can be negative (by Theorem 1), and therefore $\Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(i,k) + \Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(k,i) = l(i,k) + l(k,i) = 0$, as required.

Suppose, by way of contradiction, that $\beta(a_i) = \beta(a_k) > 0$ and $\Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(i,k) + \Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(k,i) > 0$ for some $a_i, a_k \in \mathcal{A}$. Let p be a payment function that generically implements f at a_i. We now construct a corresponding directed graph $\overrightarrow{G}$ defined as follows. The set of nodes is $\{j \mid \beta(a_j) = \beta(a_i),\ a_j \in \mathcal{A}\}$. For every pair of nodes j, j', there is an arc (j,j') in $\overrightarrow{G}$ if and only if $p(a_j) - p(a_{j'}) = \delta(a_j, a_{j'})$. We next look at the strongly connected components of $\overrightarrow{G}$.

We first claim that i and k belong to distinct strongly connected components of $\overrightarrow{G}$. Suppose not. There is thus a path P from i to k, and a path Q from k to i in $\overrightarrow{G}$. Clearly, P and Q are also paths in $G_{f,\mathcal{B}}$ (not necessarily the shortest paths), and thus $\Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(i,k) \leq l(P)$, and $\Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(k,i) \leq l(Q)$ (where $l(P), l(Q)$ denote the length of the paths P, Q in the graph $G_{f,\mathcal{B}}$, respectively). In particular, $0 < l(P) + l(Q)$.

Now, for every arc $(j,j') \in \overrightarrow{G}$ we have $p(a_j) - p(a_{j'}) = \delta(a_j, a_{j'})$. Summing these equalities along the paths gives us $0 = \Sigma_{(j,\,j') \in P}\, \delta(a_j, a_{j'}) + \Sigma_{(j,\,j') \in Q}\, \delta(a_j, a_{j'})$. But since $\delta(a_j, a_{j'}) \geq \min\{\delta(a_j, a_{j'}), \theta(a_j)\} = l(j,j')$, we obtain $0 = \Sigma_{(j,\,j') \in P}\, \delta(a_j, a_{j'}) + \Sigma_{(j,\,j') \in Q}\, \delta(a_j, a_{j'}) \geq l(P) + l(Q)$, a contradiction. We conclude that the graph $\overrightarrow{G}$ has at least 2 strongly connected components.

Let K be a strongly connected component of $\overrightarrow{G}$ with no arcs outgoing from a node in K to a node in some other strongly connected component K' of $\overrightarrow{G}$. It is easy to check that every directed graph has at least one such component (e.g., since the component graph $\overrightarrow{G}^{SCC}$ of $\overrightarrow{G}$ is a directed acyclic graph Cormen et al.(2009)Chapter 22), so that K is well defined. Based on K and p we define the following payment function:

$$p'(a) = \begin{cases} p(a) + \epsilon \text{ if } a \in K \\ p(a) \qquad \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Recall that p generically implements f at a_i and so the payment function p' satisfies IR, BF and NPT, for some small enough $\epsilon > 0$ (by Definition 7, part (2)).

We now show that p' satisfies incentive compatibility (IC). Let $f(v,B) = a$ and $f(v',B') = a'$. It suffices to show that $v(a) - p'(a) \geq v(a') - p'(a')$ for every

$a \in K$ and every $a' \in \mathcal{A}$ with $p'(a') \leq B$. Equivalently, we need to show that $v(a) - v(a') \geq p'(a) - p'(a')$ for every $a \in K$ and every $a' \in \mathcal{A}$ with $p'(a') \leq B$.[3]

We begin with the case in which $\beta(a') > \beta(a)$. Since p generically implements f at a_i, then for some small enough $\epsilon > 0$, we have that $p'(a) - p'(a') < v(a) - v(a')$ for every a' with $\beta(a') > \beta(a)$ (by Definition 7, part (4)).

Otherwise, $\beta(a') \leq \beta(a)$. By (5), $\delta(a, a') \leq v(a) - v(a')$, and thus it suffices to show in all the remaining cases that $p'(a) - p'(a') \leq \delta(a, a')$ for every $a' \in \mathcal{A}$.

Now, if $\beta(a') < \beta(a) = \beta(a_i)$, then by Claim 6.1 and Definition 7, part (3), we have that $p(a) - p(a') < \delta(a, a')$. Therefore, for some small enough $\epsilon > 0$, $p'(a) - p'(a') < \delta(a, a')$, as required.

For the remaining case $\beta(a') = \beta(a)$, there are two subcases to consider, according to whether $a' \in K$ or not. In the first subcase $p'(a) = p(a) + \epsilon$ and $p'(a') = p(a') + \epsilon$. By Claim 6.1, $p(a) - p(a') \leq \delta(a, a')$, and therefore $p'(a) - p'(a') = p(a) - p(a') \leq \delta(a, a')$, as required.

In the other subcase, $a' \notin K$. By Claim 6.1 and the fact that K has no outgoing arc in $\overrightarrow{G}$, we have $p(a) - p(a') < \delta(a, a')$, and thus for a small enough $\epsilon > 0$, $p'(a) - p'(a') < \delta(a, a')$, as required.

Finally, since $\overrightarrow{G}$ has at least 2 strongly connected components there exist $a \in K$ and $a' \notin K$ such that $\beta(a) = \beta(a')$. However, $\epsilon = p'(a) - p(a) \neq p'(a') - p(a') = 0$, contradicting the assumption that the revenue equivalence principle is satisfied. □

Claim. Let $f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ be an implementable social choice function for private budgets with no budget over-reporting. If $\Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(i,k) = -\Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(k,i)$ for all $a_i, a_k \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\beta(a_i) = \beta(a_k)$ then $f : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ satisfies the revenue equivalence principle.

Proof. Let p, p' be payments such that the mechanisms (f, p) and (f, p') are implementable with private budgets. Suppose $\Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(i,k) = -\Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(k,i)$ for all $a_i, a_k \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\beta(a_i) = \beta(a_k)$. By Theorem 1 the graph $G_{f,\mathcal{B}}$ contains no negative length cycles, and therefore all shortest paths in this graph are finite. Let P be a shortest path from node i to node k in $G_{f,\mathcal{B}}$, and let $e = (j, j+1)$ be some arc in P.

By Claim 6.1, $p_{a_j} - p_{a_{j+1}} \leq \delta(a_j, a_{j+1})$. Now, $p_{a_j} \leq \theta(a_j)$ (by IR and BF) and $p_{a_{j+1}} \geq 0$ (by NPT) and so $p_{a_j} - p_{a_{j+1}} \leq \theta(a_j)$, as well. Thus $p_{a_j} - p_{a_{j+1}} \leq \min\{\delta(a_j, a_{j+1}), \theta(a_j)\} = l(j, j+1)$. Summing over all arcs in P we have $p_{a_i} - p_{a_k} \leq l(P) = \Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(i,k)$. Similarly, $p_{a_k} - p_{a_i} \leq \Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(k,i)$. Therefore, $-\Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(k,i) \leq p_{a_i} - p_{a_k} \leq \Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(i,k)$. Since, $-\Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(k,i) = \Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(i,k)$ we have that $p_{a_i} - p_{a_k} = \Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(i,k)$. By the same argument we have that $p'_{a_i} - p'_{a_k} = \Delta_{G_{f,\mathcal{B}}}(i,k)$. Therefore, $p_{a_i} - p_{a_k} = p'_{a_i} - p'_{a_k}$ for $a_i, a_k \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\beta(a_i) = \beta(a_k)$, and thus f satisfies the revenue equivalence principle. □

[3] Clearly if $a' \notin K$, $p(a') = p'(a')$ and therefore $p(a') \leq B$ if and only if $p'(a') \leq B$. Otherwise, $p(a') + \epsilon = p'(a')$, so that for a small enough $\epsilon > 0$, $p'(a') < \theta(a') \leq \beta(a') = \beta(a) \leq B$ (by Definition 7, part (2)), thus $p(a') \leq B$ if and only if $p'(a') \leq B$.

6.5 Proofs for Section 5

Proof of Claim 5: Without loss of generality we can assume that there are only two possible outcomes: $\mathcal{A} = \{a, b\}$. Let $w(a) = (\sum_{\ell \neq \ell'} \kappa_\ell \cdot v_\ell(a)) + \gamma_a$ and $w(b) = (\sum_{\ell \neq \ell'} \kappa_\ell \cdot v_\ell(b)) + \gamma_b$.

If $w(a) = w(b)$, then $\Delta_{\ell'}(a, b, v_{-\ell'}) = 0,\ \Delta_{\ell'}(b, a, v_{-\ell'}) = 1$.

If $w(a) + 1 = w(b)$, then $\Delta_{\ell'}(a, b, v_{-\ell'}) = 1,\ \Delta_{\ell'}(b, a, v_{-\ell'}) = 0$.

Finally, if $w(a) \geq w(b) + 1$, then $\Delta_{\ell'}(a, b, v_{-\ell'}) = -\infty$. Note that this is not a violation of the the condition in Proposition 1 since f is not onto in this case. The case where $w(a) + 1 < w(b)$ is similar. □

Proof of Claim 5: Suppose not. Fix $f(v_1, \ldots, v_n) \in \text{argmax}_{\ a' \in \mathcal{A}} \{\sum_\ell \kappa_\ell \cdot v_\ell(a') + \gamma_{a'}\}$, such that $\kappa_1 > 0, \ldots, \kappa_n > 0$ and $\gamma_{a'} \in \mathbb{R}$ in an arbitrary manner. Without loss of generality (by renaming players and outcomes if necessary), we assume that $B_1 < \infty$ and that $\gamma_a \geq \gamma_b$, where $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. We first prove for the case of two players. Consider the following valuations:

$$v_1(x) = \begin{cases} B_1 + 1 \text{ if } x = a \\ 0 \qquad \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Additionally,

$$v_2(x) = \begin{cases} \kappa_1/\kappa_2 \cdot (B_1 + 1 + L) & \text{if } x = a \\ \kappa_1/\kappa_2 \cdot (2(B_1 + 1) + L) + (\gamma_a - \gamma_b)/\kappa_2 & \text{if } x = b \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that for sufficiently large $L > 0$ and every $c \in \mathcal{A}$ we have

$$\gamma_a + \sum_i \kappa_i v_i(a) \ = \ \gamma_b + \sum_i \kappa_i v_i(b) \ \geq \ \gamma_c + \sum_i \kappa_i v_i(c).$$

Now, fix v_1, v_2. If player 1 increases $v_1(b)$ by $\epsilon > 0$ then b will be chosen, and therefore: $\delta_1(b, a) \leq v_1(b) - v_1(a) = -(B_1 + 1)$. Additionally, if player 1 increases $v_1(a)$ by $\epsilon > 0$ then a will be chosen and therefore $\theta_1(a) = \min\{B_1,\ \inf\{v_1'(a) \mid v_1' \in \mathcal{V}_1 \text{ such that } f(v_1', v_2) = a\}\} = \min\{B_1,\ B_1 + 1\} = B_1$.

Now, $0 > \delta_1(b, a) + \theta_1(a) \geq l(b, a) + l(a, b)$ and therefore the graph $G_{f,B}$ has a negative cycle. By Theorem 2, f is not implementable, a contradiction. To prove the theorem for $n > 2$ players , we can add $n - 2$ players with zero valuations and arbitrary public budgets. □